REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 11 are pending in the application. Claims 9 and 11 have been amended. Claim 10 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of the pending claims.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0065942 to Lineman et al. ("Lineman"). Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lineman in view of Townsend. Applicant overcomes the rejections as follows.

The Examiner's rejection appears to hinge on equating the term "information security object (ISO)" with a "policy document" as disclosed in Lineman. However, ISO's are small elements that in larger numbers together may form parts of policy documents. The same objects are or can be used and re-used in surveys and in multiple other contexts, for example audits and risk assessments. The reuse effectively eliminates the need for making users maintain similar or associated content in multiple places, and also eliminates or minimizes the risk of wrong associations or references, for example between parts of policies, quiz questions, answers, audit lists, risk assessments.

Specifically, Claim 1 sets forth, *inter alia*, "a policy module...for the conversion of said piece of security information into an information security object (ISO)..., and a survey module...for generating from said ISO an element of a questionnaire." Claim 1 sets forth using ISOs in a policy module and generating questionnaires from ISOs. Questionnaires that are generated from ISOs provide an automation of the quiz generation process. In an automated process, users do not need to draft and edit similar content twice, since it is the same content (data) that constitutes the policies and the quizzes.

Lineman discloses in paragraph **[0032]** and FIGS. 4A and 4B, how an administrative user can input policy content, however Lineman fails to disclose how surveys are automatically generated by the system. In contrast, Lineman in FIGS. 7A, 7B and 7C illustrates that generating quizzes is a manual process that an administrative user has to carry out. The Lineman system "allows the administrator to design questions" (Lineman, para. **[0032]**), meaning the quizzes are manually created, not automatically "generating from said ISO an element of a questionnaire" as set forth in Claim 1.

Lineman does not teach or suggest the invention set forth in Claim 1 since, as illustrated in FIGS. 4B and 5A, the described content cannot be used for quizzing. There is no disclosure which teaches a means for an administrative user to provide right and wrong answers and there are certainly no means described for the policy management program to automatically determine any right and wrong answers. Lineman does not describe nor use any policy entities (smaller or larger entities) where right and wrong questions can be specified. The present invention is different, in that the policies and the quizzes are created from the same small information security objects. Quizzes and policies are not "associated". They are both built with the same objects. If an administrative user selects a number of objects, the quiz may be automatically prepared, or, building a quiz with objects also builds a policy.

In contrast, Lineman discloses that the quizzes are associated with the security policy document, and Lineman states that the policy document or a part of the policy document and the quiz are not the same. (Lineman, para. **[0036]**) In Lineman different elements need to be associated. The fact that quizzes in Lineman are not identical to policy documents or to parts of policy documents is disclosed in **[0041]**, where Lineman describes that drafting and editing policies is another [user] activity than drafting and editing quizzes. FIG. 7C of Lineman shows that quizzes are entered manually and so are policies. In addition, Lineman at paragraph **[0047]** describes that "other fields" include examples of quiz questions.

Accordingly, since Lineman does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 1 or Claim 7 (which sets forth features similar to Claim 1), Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Lineman. Dependent Claims 2-6, which include the features of independent Claim 1, and dependent Claim 8, which includes the features of independent Claim 7, recite additional features of particular advantage and utility. Moreover, these claims are allowable for substantially the same reasons presented above

Regarding Claim 2, Lineman teaches that only quizzes based on data a quiz administrator has entered manually may be scored. As set forth in Claim 2, quizzes based on one or more information security objects that include right / wrong answer options automatically being determined may be scored. The present invention is less burdensome to use, because it involves less steps and does not have the disadvantage of possibly misleading quiz questions.

What is referred to as "Education" in Lineman is simply the quizzes (see paragraph **[0065]** and Fig. 7A). Educational Module in the present invention includes multimedia, e.g. sound, speak, voices, animations, moving pictures, video recordings and recorded computer screen shots, which may provide information security learning to computer users throughout the organization.

Claim 9 sets forth, *inter alia*, "said ISO including modular content derived from said security information and having a unique identifier and security level value, said unique identifier used to link said ISO to an organization and said security level value used to create a security policy including the ISO which matches a default security level value of the organisation." Claim 9 also sets forth, "a survey module communicating with said memory means and said output means for generating from said ISO an element of a questionnaire." Neither Lineman nor Townsend, nor their combination, teaches or suggests an ISO including these features.

The invention set forth in Claim 9 provides security awareness in an organization, and uses ISOs to generate polices. Since the generated policies are built with ISO's this kind of policy document offers a much higher use value and automation options than policy documents built without ISOs. Lineman and Townsend do not disclose a system that provides awareness, quizzes, or education in an automated way. With Townsend and Lineman, administrators or users would need to manually create educational programs, quizzes, answers, and/or in addition to manually creating policies.

Neither Townsend nor Lineman produce automated awareness quizzes, nor do they provide security education as set forth in the present invention, nor do they utilize or describe any elements that can provide the same obvious benefits as the Information Security Objects.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 9 is allowable over Lineman in view of Townsend. Lineman in view of Townsend does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claim 9. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Townsend. Claim 11 sets forth, *inter alia*, "modularising the security information to create an information security object (ISO); assigning a security level value to said ISO; compiling said information security

object into a security policy including other ISOs having the same security level value; and generating in a survey module an element of a questionnaire from said ISO." As discussed above with regard to Claims 1 and 9, Townsend neither teaches nor suggests these features.

Specifically, Townsend discloses an "Adaptive countermeasure selection method and apparatus," in contrast to an "Information security awareness system" of the present invention. Information security policy awareness is by many information security experts considered an appropriate countermeasure. Townsend uses "policy awareness" as a countermeasure example in Townsend (see paragraphs **[0027], [0033] and [0051]**). However, Townsend does not teach or suggest a policy manager nor a survey manager that uses anything like information security objects as set forth in Claim 11, nor does Townsend describe any elements or entities similar to Information Security Objects. Townsend uses questionnaires for determining strength level of countermeasures, i.e. for risk assessments purposes, and it is certainly not obvious to use the same questionnaires for policy awareness purposes. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 11 is allowable over Townsend.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons presented above, Applicant respectfully submits that this application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. If there is any further hindrance to allowance of the pending claims, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1159.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 1, 2008

Theodore P Lopez
Registration No. 44,881
Klein, O'Neill & Singh, LLP
43 Corporate Park Drive, Suite 204
Irvine, California 92606
Tel: (949) 955-1920
Fax: (949) 955 1921